

From: [Hudson, Scott](#)
To: [Curry, Tim](#)
Subject: Re: V/H plot
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 12:59:46 PM

Thank you Tim. I appreciate the insight, we'll have to keep this in mind.
Scott

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 31, 2019, at 1:56 PM, Curry, Tim <Curry.Timothy@epa.gov> wrote:

Eric and Ross,

I am forwarding the email I received from the primary scientist who is currently directing the DPDS contract efforts. The event he references and the follow on discussions with the ARSS contractor highlight performance concerns of the contracts going forward. The new CORs will need to be keenly aware of the differences in the work efforts between contractors. For the record I wanted to make sure you were made aware of this as it will likely become an issue during upcoming performance ratings. The ARSS contractor performance ratings have been dipping and will obviously continue in that direction. These ratings will be important for the upcoming solicitation. The contractor is incentivized to at a minimum contest any poor performance rating and at worst file some legal complaint directed at the CORs making the ratings.

I was called by Sam Fritcher after he talked with Dr. Kroutil and before I received the below email. Sam had been inquiring with the DPDS contractor about how low we could fly and still get good data. He was disappointed in not being allowed to fly and was likely concerned the decision on my part was arbitrary. He was seeking information from the DPDS contractor regarding data collection capabilities of the sensors with regards to altitudes and speeds. I had indicated during our conference calls regarding flights at the ITC site that lower altitudes and cloud cover beneath the aircraft can seriously degrade the data. There was no need to fly and collect data that would not be useful. After Sam had talked with Dr. Kroutil he called me to request that he be provided the v/s chart that they had discussed. He indicated that none of his staff were aware of this data collection limitation. I was surprised by his insinuation that we seemed to be placing some new specification on them. I indicated that I believed it has been a performance criteria of the contracts for some time. Due to the agency's promotion of the use of the performance based contracting approach we had long ago looked at the type of performance standards that could be incorporated into the ASPECT contracts. We then discussed how I believed it was still a performance criteria in the current contract but it might be possible it had been dropped just before awarding the last contract. I know that previous pilots and system operators were trained and aware of the flight performance needs. Those previous employees have left and even some of their replacements have left since then.

Sam had the contract in electronic form on his computer so he called it up while we were on the phone. As he read the various sections in the table of contents I told him which appendix to look at. He called it up and as he read it realized that his contract actually had this as well as other performance criteria the whole time. He then indicated that his staff never knew of it and he needed to get the chart for reference. At that time I discussed with him that the ancillary data recorded with each data collection pass included the information needed to determine compliance with some of their performance criteria. I told him that the government CORs on the contract knew how and where to review the data. We had previously trained their operators on where to access the information and how it could affect the data quality. Again their crew changes so frequently that it has affected their ability to retain appropriate knowledge and skills to perform. Mission orders have typically been issued by the CORs then distributed and discussed during the pre-flight missions. The science trained CORs have consistently taken into account the potential for deviations from the specifications. We made a distinct effort to set up missions to minimize chances to have an effect on the data acquisition and processing. Deviations to some extent can be managed by the scientific reach back team but it places an unnecessary burden that causes additional time and cost to the government. In an emergency or extremely urgent situation even degraded information might be important. This highlights why the government needs to make the 'go, no go' decisions.

This is not the first issue with this contractor. If you would like we can have a call to discuss them. I was taken back by the contractor's claim that they did not know about their performance criteria seven years into their five year contract. The optics of me leaving the program and the contractor receiving a poor performance rating might easily be brushed off as some kind of sour grapes.

From: Kroutil Robert <robert.kroutil@kalmancoinc.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2019 4:26 PM

To: Curry, Tim <Curry.Timothy@epa.gov>

Cc: markthomasottks@gmail.com; Turville Rick <Rick.Turville@kalmancoinc.com>

Subject: V/H plot

Tim,

Sam called me today asking for the conditions that he should fly at various altitudes. This became a problem today for the ITC flights. Here is the plot at 0.06 rad/sec for the RS800. Dale and Max came up with the plot which we have had since 1998.

Apparently, today was the first time that Airborne ASPECT had heard of this concept. I know Baron knows this as he talked to me about it about a year ago. Frankly, I was astonished at the lack of understanding of this basic concept for collecting data for the ASPECT program. I know you guys have been trying to educate them on this concept over many years and even this information was written in the Airborne ASPECT's contract. How many years have we been collecting data ?

I will let the Government decide how to approach this issue.

Max sent along an excel file showing an analysis of one of their flight tests.

Regards,

Bob